

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

| | | |
|------------------|---|------------|
| MICHAEL JACKSON, |) | |
| |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | 4:08CV3155 |
| |) | |
| v. |) | |
| |) | |
| FRED BRITTEN, |) | ORDER |
| |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

On April 28, 2009, the Court dismissed petitioner's habeas corpus claims with prejudice and entered judgment against him (Filing Nos. [14](#) and [15](#)). On May 15, 2009, petitioner filed a timely Notice of Appeal of the court's Judgment (Filing No. [16](#)).

Before petitioner may appeal the dismissal of his Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, a "Certificate of Appealability" must issue. Pursuant to the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA"), the right to appeal such a dismissal is governed by [28 U.S.C. § 2253\(c\)](#), which states:

(c)(1) Unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability, an appeal may not be taken to the court of appeals from-

(A) the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding in which the detention complained of arises out of process issued by a State court

(2) A certificate of appealability may issue under paragraph (1) only if the applicant has made a

substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

(3) The certificate of appealability under paragraph (1) shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).¹

A certificate of appealability may issue only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. See [28 U.S.C. § 2253\(c\)\(2\)](#). Such a showing requires a demonstration "that reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further." [Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 \(2000\)](#) (internal quotation marks omitted), citing [Barefoot v. Estelle, 463 U.S. 894 \(1983\)](#) (defining pre-AEDPA standard for a certificate of probable cause to appeal).

Petitioner has not filed a motion for a certificate of appealability or a brief in support. (See [Docket Sheet](#).) Thus, this matter cannot proceed on appeal until the question of the certificate of appealability is considered.

¹ Similarly, [Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22\(b\)](#), as amended by the AEDPA, indicates that in an action pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 2254](#), a notice of appeal triggers the requirement that the district judge who rendered the judgment either issue a certificate of appealability or state the reasons why such a certificate should not issue. See generally [Tiedeman v. Benson, 122 F.3d 518, 521 \(8th Cir. 1997\)](#).

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Petitioner shall have until June 29, 2009, to file a motion for certificate of appealability and brief in support.

2. In the event that petitioner fails to file a motion and brief as set forth in this Memorandum and Order, the Court will deny the issuance of a certificate of appealability without further notice.

3. The clerk of the court is directed to set a pro se case management in this case with the following text: June 29, 2009: check for filing of motion for certificate of appealability.

DATED this 16th day of June, 2009.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Lyle E. Strom

LYLE E. STROM, Senior Judge
United States District Court